



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,792	07/21/2003	Thomas J. Burke	660041-2002.1	6106

7590 11/30/2006
JOANNE M. MARTIN
40 NORTH SPRING STREET
CONCORD, NH 03301-3902

EXAMINER

REDMAN, JERRY E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3634

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/623,792

Applicant(s)

BURKE, THOMAS J.

Examiner

Jerry Redman

Art Unit

3634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

The applicant's information disclosure statement dated 9/19/2005 has been considered and a copy has been placed in the file.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1, lines 7-15 and in claim 10, lines 15-23, the phraseology is not readily understood by the Examiner. Specifically, the applicant recites a programmable electronic controller responsive to at least one of (a) selective gate operating parameters (exactly what are these?), and (b) a selective electrical signals (what is meant by selective electrical signals?) in response thereto (in response to what?) to said gate means (not clear what is being claimed) to programmably control at least one of (c) a first gate position motion initiation in response to a second gate position (not readily apparent what is meant by first gate position motion initiation and more specifically first gate position motion initiation to a second position), (d) a gate position duration (specifically, what is meant by "gate position duration"?), (e) a communication of diagnostic data, (f) a communication of video data, (g) an initiation of a failure condition, and (h) the reception (specifically, what is meant by reception of data?) of electronic controller programming data.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 3634

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr in view of Bertieri et al. Carr discloses a crossing assembly comprising a gate means (15) connectable to a stanchion (14 and 16) and movable between a generally upright position to permit access therethrough, and a controller (38) for controlling the function and operation of the door. Carr fails to disclose a programmable controller using relays and wireless links which are responsive to the movement of the gate. Bertieri et al. disclose a controller using relays and wireless remote control links to program and operate a movable closure. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the assembly of Carr with a programmable controller as taught by Bertieri et al. since a programmable controller allows one to change and operate the function of a closure from a remote location.

Claim 7 is further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr and Bertieri et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Keeling et al. All of the elements of the instant invention are discussed in detail above except providing a camera. Keeling et al. disclose a camera (38) to monitor the movement of traffic through a gate crossing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the assembly of Carr with a camera as taught by Keeling et al. since a camera allows one to monitor areas of traffic and more particularly, traffic which could be recorded and/or monitored on a real time basis due to terrorists.

Claims 8 and 9 are further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr and Bertieri et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Fox or Loban et al. All of the elements of the instant invention are discussed in detail above except providing lights that are bulletproof. Fox discloses "bulletproof" lights (38, depending on what type of bullet and specifically how the applicant defines "bulletproof", the lights of Fox are durable and rigidly attached). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the gate means of Carr with "bulletproof" lights as taught by Fox since the lights of Fox provide durability in harsh environments as well as providing a signal that extends along the gate means. Loban et al. disclose a "bulletproof" lighting assembly. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the gate means of Carr with a "bulletproof" lighting assembly as taught by Loban et al. since a "bulletproof" lighting assembly provides durability in harsh environments as well as a light system for lighting up the gate means.


Depending on the applicant's amendments, it appears that claims 10-20 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

The applicant's arguments have been considered but are not deemed persuasive. The additional phraseology to claim 1 appears to overcome the double

Art Unit: 3634

patenting rejection. Depending on the applicant's amendments in the future, a double patenting rejection may be warranted in the future. Furthermore, the applicant's arguments are based on the additional phraseology to claims 1 and 10 and as discussed in detail above, the additional amendments are not readily understood by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jerry Redman at telephone number 571-272-6835.


Jerry Redman
Primary Examiner